## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. CR 17-391 EMC
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIPL ACT
Defendant.  For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from 18 Aug 17, to 18 by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the parties of t	oublic and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance would be See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the proor law, that it is unreasonable to expect	due to [check applicable reasons] the number of osecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial d by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	leny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, e diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	inreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given itments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	anreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time king into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED: 8/18/2017	Sly MA Comb
	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Randy Sue Pollock Attorney for Defendant	R. Ceonard R. R. Assistant United States Attorney